

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/030,894	11/12/2001	Johan Willem Gosselink	T0853 US	6052
7590 01/02/2004			EXAM	INER
Richard F Lemuth			MEDINA SANABRIA, MARIBEL	
Shell Oil Company Intellectual Property			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PO Box 2463			1754	
Houston, TX 77252-2463			DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, ,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/030,894	GOSSELINK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Maribel Medina	1754
The MAILING DATE of this communica Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) do - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir yry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on 12 November 2001.	
_	☐ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice	allowance except for formal matt	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5 ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-6,9-11,14,15,18,19 and 21-3</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>7-8, 16-17,20</u> is/are objected to 8 ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration. 24 is/are rejected. to.	
Application Papers	Transfor election requirement.	
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the E	Syaminar	
10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the £		objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internationa * See the attached detailed Office action f 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a since a specific reference was included in 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign languated acknowledgment is made of a claim for a reference was included in the first sentence.	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in A the priority documents have been I Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). or a list of the certified copies not domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. In the first sentence of the specific lage provisional application has b domestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	Application No I received in this National Stage received. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) cation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper	-948) 5) Notice of I	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 1754

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because: The identifier "Fig. 1" should be deleted. See 37 CFR 1.84 (u) (1) "Where only a single view is used in an application to illustrate the claimed invention, it must not be numbered and the abbreviation "FIG." Must not appear." Correction is required.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "Fig.1" in page 11, lines 25 and 26; page 12, line 27; and page 13, lines 3 and 14 should be changed to -The Figure--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the watergas-shift step". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1754

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 14-15, 18-19 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,152,976 (Fong et al) as evidenced by US Patent No. 4,225,418 (Hilfman).

Fong et al disclose a process for producing hydrogen wherein refinery off gas is first passed through a partial oxidation unit and then thru a shift converter in order to obtain a purified hydrogen-containing gas. The refinery off gas used as feedstock generally contains saturated and unsaturated hydrocarbons and other impurities such as organic sulphur, nitrogen species, and inorganic agents including H₂S, COS, SOx, NH₃, HCN and arsine. The refinery off gas is generated in processes such as hydrotreating units. (See col. 2, lines 47-67). Fong et al further discloses that the produced hydrogen can be used in a variety of applications such as hydrocracking (See col. 6, lines 34-42).

Fong et al disclose treating off gas streams from a hydrotreating unit. Hilfman is provided as evidenced to show that a hydrotreating process encompasses the process of hydrocracking (See col. 1, lines 29-42). Therefore the instantly claimed invention is fully disclosed by Fong et al.

In regards to the limitations of claims 2-3, 6, 9, 11, 14-15, and 21-24, the process of Fong et al will inherently provide them once the hydrocracking step is carried out. Hilfman shows that hydrocracking comprises hydrocracking a hydrocarbonaceous material into lower boiling point hydrocarbons, with a zeolite-containing catalyst (See col. 3, lines 26-40). Hilfman further discloses that the products on hydrocracking processes comprise among others kerosene

Art Unit: 1754

and gas oil (See col. 3, lines 60-67). Hilfman further discloses a hydrocracking temperature in the range from 600-900°F (315-482°C) and a pressure in the range of 500-5000 psig (34-340 atm) (See col. 4, lines 27-32). Regarding claim 10, Fong et al disclose the removal of hydrogen sulphide present in the gaseous stream in order to produce elemental sulphur.

Note that the secondary reference (Hilfman) isnly provided as evidence. "To serve as an anticipation when the reference is silent about the asserted inherent characteristic, such gap in the reference may be filled with recourse to extrinsic evidence. Such evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill." (See *Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 1268, 20 USPQ 2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

No difference is seen between the instantly claimed invention d Fong et al disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claim 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fong et al as evidenced by Hilfman as applied to claims 1-6, 9-11, 14-15, 18-19, and 21-24 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,853,566 (Kraushaar-Czarnetzki et al).

Fong et al as evidenced by Hilfman apply herein as above. Fong et al as evidenced by Hilfman fail to disclose that the zeolite catalyst for the hydrocracking process is a beta zeolite.

Art Unit: 1754

Kraushaar-Czarnetzki et al is relied upon to teach the use of beta zeolites in hydrocracking process to produced lower boiling hydrocarbons.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a beta zeolite as the zeolite on the hydrocarbon catalyst of Fong et al as evidenced by Hilfman, since Hilfman process is directed to any known zeolite and since Kraushaar-Czarnetzki et al disclose the advantages of a beta zeolite, over other zeolites. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use a beta zeolite in view of its enhanced activity on hydrocracking process as taught by Kraushaar-Czarnetzki et al

Allowable Subject Matter

- 9. Claims 7, 8, 16, 17 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

 Claims 7, 8, 16, 17 and 20 discloses allowable subject matter, Fong et al discloses the partial oxidation of the gases to be treated, however, fail to disclose or suggest and teaches away for the "catalytic" partial oxidation of the gases. Note that Fong et al clearly disclose in claim 1, that thee partial oxidation is carried out in the absence of a catalyst.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maribel Medina whose telephone number is (571) 272-1355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1754

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0994.

Maribel Medina
Examiner
Art Unit 1754

Page 6